

REMARKS

Claim 1 has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Boustany et al. and Posiviata et al. Also, claim 5 has been rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over each of Boustany et al. and Posiviata et al. in view of Saito et al. and Corvasce et al. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

First of all, it should be noted that the present application originally contained claims 1-11, but the Examiner's Office Action has only appeared to be applied to claims 1 and 5 as noted on page 2 of the Examiner's Office Action letter. It is respectfully requested that the Examiner clarify the status of all of the claims of the present application and, in this regard, indicate which claims are allowable and which claims are rejected.

The present invention is directed to a rubber composition for use in tire treads. In this connection, it should be noted that all of the claims of the present invention application have been amended to specifically recite that the rubber composition of the present invention is not directed to the tire *per se* but rather to tire treads. As noted in claim 1 of the present application, the tire treads contained from 0.5 to 12 parts by weight of paper relative to 100 parts by weight of the rubber component, said paper having a width of 5 mm or less. As noted on page 5 of the present application, if less than 0.5 parts by weight of paper are compounded, the effect of the compounding is small. On the other hand if more than 12 parts by weight of paper are compounded, the hardness and modulus of the resultant rubber composition are high and thus

when such a rubber composition is used in a tire, the basic characteristics of the tire may not be satisfactory.

As recited in claim 3 of the present application, from 10 to 100 parts by weight of carbon black, relative to 100 parts by weight of the rubber component, are compounded. If the carbon black is used in combination with silica, the compounded carbon black is 0.1 to 10 times as much as the amount of the compounded silica. The carbon black preferably has physical properties whereby the specific surface area is from 40 to 160 m²/g, the DBP oil absorption is from 70 to 130 ml/100 g and the iodine adsorption value is from 70 to 130 mg/g. Carbon black having these physical properties can be compounded together with the paper and silica to synergistically enhance the reinforcing effect. It is the Applicants' position that the specific properties of the rubber composition of the present invention as defined in the claims of the present application, especially claims 1 and 3 as discussed herein above together with the fact that the present invention uses shredded paper directly for blending with the rubber component clearly distinguishes from the prior art relied upon by the Examiner, particularly when it is recognized that the cited references do not use shredded paper directly to blend with the rubber component but rather use cellulose fiber which is obtained from shredded paper. Also, the present invention utilizes the rubber composition for tire treads whereas none of the references relied upon by the Examiner disclose a rubber composition which focuses on the use of paper waste for tire treads. As noted on page 35, lines 25-28 of the present application, when the rubber composition of the present invention is used in a tread portion of a tire,

abrasion resistance as well as cornering and braking performances can be remarkably enhanced.

Accordingly, it is believed that the claims of the present application as presently amended clearly distinguish the present invention from the prior art relied upon the Examiner and accordingly reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all of the claims in the present application are respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Mr. Joseph A. Kolasch (Reg. No. 22,463) at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicants respectfully petition for a one-month extension of time for filing a reply in connection with the present application, and the required fee of \$110 is attached hereto.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Joseph A. Kolasch (Reg. No. 22,463)

JAK/njp
0033-0741P

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000